

**I-70 Mountain Corridor Traffic & Revenue Study  
2013-2014**

**Core Values, Critical Issues, Critical Success Factors, Level 1 Performance Measures**

<b>Core Values</b>	<b>Critical Issues</b>	<b>Critical Success Factors</b>	<b>Level 1 Performance Measures</b>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe Traffic Operations</li> <li>• Emergency Response</li> <li>• Incident Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing safety for all is a priority. Balance the anticipated needs of capacity and safety improvements with minimized impacts.</li> <li>• Provide reliable access and protection for emergency responders to / from and through the corridor accident/incident scenes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative meet minimum design standards (AASHTO, CDOT, etc) of cross section, curvature, sight distance and grades?</li> <li>• Does the alternative provide safe reliable access ?</li> <li>• Does the alternative provide protection for incident responders?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have the potential to reduce crashes?</li> </ul>
Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel Time Reliability</li> <li>• Slow Moving Vehicles</li> <li>• Modal Choice</li> <li>• Local Mobility</li> <li>• Incident Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a multimodal solution that improves mobility, reliability, increases person trips, efficiently manages slow moving vehicles, provides incident response access, and reduces travel time .</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative reduce travel times for long distance trips for all users?</li> <li>• Does the alternative reduce the travel time for short distance trips for all users both on and off the Interstate?</li> <li>• Does the alternative offer competitive modal choices with reliable travel times?</li> <li>• Does the alternative allow for increased person trips?</li> <li>• Does the alternative provide for incident management?</li> </ul>
Constructability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Efficiency of Operations &amp; Maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop funding priorities to construct financially feasible improvements that use innovative and efficient practices which have the greatest ability to preserve, conserve and maintain existing environment and future improvements. Must be "buildable".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the construction of the alternative financially feasible with the minimal funding?</li> <li>• Does the alternative provide flexibility for future expansion and modification?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have a positive impact on operations and maintenance?</li> </ul>
Engineering Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aesthetics</li> <li>• Adherence to Accepted Design Standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS process to create and assess financially feasible infrastructure improvements that adhere to acceptable engineering standards and are inspired compatible with the natural surroundings and provide the best value for their life-cycle while not precluding future opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative provide opportunities to balance aesthetics and engineering?</li> <li>• Does the alternative adhere to the I-70 CSS Mountain Corridor Guidelines and specific design criteria?</li> </ul>

**I-70 Mountain Corridor Traffic & Revenue Study  
2013-2014**

**Core Values, Critical Issues, Critical Success Factors, Level 1 Performance Measures**

<b>Core Values</b>	<b>Critical Issues</b>	<b>Critical Success Factors</b>	<b>Level 1 Performance Measures</b>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve Future Transportation Options</li> <li>• Energy Use</li> <li>• Maintenance</li> <li>• Impact of No Action</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address the continuing decline of mobility and accessibility along the corridor by developing long-term multi-modal transportation solutions that are compatible with the natural surroundings and minimize the use of non-renewable resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative protect existing natural resources?</li> <li>• Does the alternative use existing natural resources efficiently to generate improvements in efficiency and mobility?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have the potential to improve operations and maintenance?</li> </ul>
Decision Making Process (Local, Regional, Statewide)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSS Guidance</li> <li>• Stakeholder Support</li> <li>• Public Acceptance</li> <li>• Identify &amp; Prioritize Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a transparent (fair, open, equitable and inclusive) CSS process utilizing relevant and defensible data and a consistent set of assumptions.</li> <li>• Obtain general agreement by the public, the Project Leadership Team, and stakeholders of the study process and results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative provide opportunities for enhancements (i.e. recreational, community, environmental)?</li> <li>• Is the alternative consistent with the Record of Decision?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have a minimal risk of public or political opposition?</li> </ul>
Community (Local, Regional, Statewide)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance Recreational Opportunities</li> <li>• Enhance Community Values</li> <li>• Improve Economic Vitality &amp; Livability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance a solution that improves local, regional and statewide livability and economic vitality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative improve access to key destinations along the corridor, including recreation areas?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have the potential to improve livability and vitality locally, regionally, and statewide?</li> </ul>
Historic Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preservation &amp; Enhancement of Historic Elements &amp; Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable a positive experience for local residents and tourists through preservation and enhancement of historic elements and landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative have the ability to protect Historic Districts and Landmarks?</li> <li>• Does the alternative have opportunities for mitigation and / or enhancement to historic districts and landmarks?</li> </ul>
Healthy Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Sensitivity</li> <li>• Ability to Mitigate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify solutions that avoid, minimize, enhance and/or mitigate environmental impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative have the potential to avoid immitigable environmental impacts?</li> </ul>
Fiscal Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Life Cycle Considerations</li> <li>• Benefit - Cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assure fiscal responsibility through sustainable revenue generation and minimized public funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the alternative have the ability to be financially self sustaining in terms of capital and operations and maintenance costs with minimal public funding?</li> </ul>